

USSN: 10/824,569

Group No. 2819

Examiner: Nguyen, Linh V

Page 14

REMARKS**Amendments to the claims**

Claims 1-69 are pending in the application. Claims 1 and 68 have been canceled without prejudice. Claim 2 has been amended to incorporate the features of claim 1. Claim 3 has been amended to depend on claim 2. Claim 4 has been amended to incorporate the features of original claim 1 and original claim 3. Claim 37 has been amended and made dependent on claim 36. Claim 69 has been amended for clarity reasons as supported, for example, by Figure 21 and related portions of the specification. No new matter has been added.

Claim Objections

In section 4 of the Action, the Examiner objects to claims 37 and 69. The Applicant has amended claim 37 and 69 as shown in the above listing of claims and submits that the objections of the Examiner have been overcome.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 102

In section 6 of the Action, the Examiner rejects claims 1, 3, 18, 19, 34-36, 41-43 and 68 under 35 USC § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Pat. No. 5,404,142 to Adams.

Claim 1

The Applicant has canceled claim 1, thus rendering the rejection of the Examiner moot.

Claim 3

The Applicant has made claim 3 dependent on objected claim 2 which, in turn, has been rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim 1. Therefore, the Applicant submits that the rejection of claim 3 has been overcome.

USSN: 10/824,569

Group No. 2819

Examiner: Nguyen, Linh V

Page 15

Claims 18 and 19

The Applicant has made claim 18 dependent on objected claim 2 which, in turn, has been rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim 1. Claim 19 depends on amended claim 18. Therefore, the Applicant submits that the rejection of claims 18 and 19 has been overcome.

Claims 34-36

In the Action, the Examiner rejects claims 34-36 under 35 USC § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Pat. No. 5,404,142 to Adams. The Applicant respectfully disagrees.

Claim 34 recites "*a clocking arrangement to pipeline the switch*" (emphasis added). According to the Examiner, Adams discloses this feature at Figure 6 and column 5, lines 18-20. However, column 5, lines 18-20 of Adams only states that the circuitry 38 of Figure 6 produces a swap/no-swap signal, i.e. tells the switch when to switch. Mere production of a swap/no-swap signal is different from an arrangement that "*pipeline[s] the switch*" as claimed in claim 34. Should the Examiner disagree, the Examiner is respectfully requested to show where, in Adams, such feature is disclosed, taught or suggested. Therefore, the Applicant submits that amended claim 34 is novel over Adams, together with claims 35 and 36, by virtue of their dependence on claim 34.

Claims 41-43

Claim 41 recites "[a] circuit comprising . . . a switch . . . and a tuning arrangement to frequency adjust the switch." According to the Examiner (see page 5 of the Action, third paragraph), the "*tuning arrangement*" feature "*to frequency adjust the switch*" is disclosed at column 6, lines 51-55 of Adams. The Applicant respectfully disagrees. Column 6, lines 51-55 of Adams make reference to Fig. 9 and talk about the XOR function. However, a XOR is a control element allowing a switch to decide whether to switch or not, as shown in Adam's table at column 5, lines 25-35, not a "*tuning arrangement to frequency adjust the switch*" as recited in claim 41. The Applicant has not been able to find, in Adams, such arrangement.

USSN: 10/824,569

Group No. 2819

Examiner: Nguyen, Linh V

Page 16

Therefore, the Applicant submits that claim 41 is novel over Adams, together with claims 42 and 43, by virtue of their dependency on claim 41. Should the Examiner disagree, the Examiner is respectfully requested to show where, in Adams, such feature is disclosed, taught or suggested.

Claim 68

The Applicant has canceled claim 68 without prejudice, thus rendering the rejection of the Examiner moot.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 103

In section 8 of the Action, the Examiner rejects claim 44 under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Adams as applied to claim 43 and further in view of U.S. Pat. No. 6,124, 813 to Robertson. The Applicant respectfully disagrees. As shown above, Adams does not anticipate claim 43. Therefore, the Examiner has not made a prima facie 35 USC § 103(a) case against claim 44 by combining Robertson with Adams as applied to claim 43. Therefore, the Applicant submits that claim 44 is patentable over Adams and Robertson.

Allowable subject matter

i)

In section 9 of the Action, the Examiner states that claims 2, 4-17, 20-33, 37-40, and 45-47 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

The Applicant has complied with the Examiner's requirement with reference to claims 2 and 4. As to claims 5-17 and 20-33, those claims depend directly or indirectly on amended claim 4, so that no rewriting is required. Further, with reference to claim 37, such claim has been amended to be dependent on claim 36, which depends on claim 34. In view of the fact that the Applicant believes claim 34 to be patentable, it is submitted that no rewriting of claim 37 is required. As to

USSN: 10/824,569

Group No. 2819

Examiner: Nguyen, Linh V

Page 17

claims 38-40, those claims depend directly or indirectly on claim 37, so that no rewriting is required.

With reference to claims 45-47, those claims depend directly or indirectly on claim 44. The Applicant has already shown above that claim 44 is believed to be patentable over the cited art. Therefore, also claims 45-47 are believed to be patentable by virtue of their dependency on claim 44.

ii)

In section 9 of the Action, the Examiner further states that claim 69 is objected to because of a minor correction and that such claim would allowable once such correction is made. The Applicant has appropriately amended claim 69 as shown above and submits that claim 69 is now allowable.

iii)

In section 9 of the Action, the Examiner further states that claims 48-52 and 53-67 are allowed. The Applicant thanks the Examiner for the indication of allowability of those claims.

* * *

The Applicant submit that all claims of the application as amended herein are in condition for allowance. Prompt issuance of a Notice of Allowance is earnestly solicited.

USSN: 10/824,569

Group No. 2819

Examiner: Nguyen, Linh V

Page 18

The Commissioner is authorized to charge any additional fees which may be required or credit overpayment to deposit account no. 12-0415. In particular, if this response is not timely filed, then the Commissioner is authorized to treat this response as including a petition to extend the time period pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136 (a) requesting an extension of time of the number of months necessary to make this response timely filed and the petition fee due in connection therewith may be charged to deposit account no. 12-0415.

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being facsimile transmitted to the United States Patent and Trademark Office, fax no. (703)-872-9306 on

April 8, 2005

(Date of Deposit)

Susan Papp

(Name of Person Depositing)

Susan Papp

Signature

04/08/05

Date

Respectfully submitted,

Alessandro Steinfel

Alessandro Steinfel

Attorney for Applicant

Reg. No. 56,448

LADAS & PARRY

5670 Wilshire Blvd., Suite 2100

Los Angeles, CA 90036

(323)934-2300